



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ARTICLE VII.

PROFESSED QUOTATIONS FROM MANU FOUND IN THE MAHĀBHĀRATA.

By EDWARD W. HOPKINS,
INSTRUCTOR IN COLUMBIA COLLEGE, NEW YORK CITY.

Presented to the Society October 25th, 1883.

BEFORE proceeding to a discussion of the Epic Manu, a few words in regard to Manu's position in the older literature will be useful.

It has been suggested that Manu is not especially a Hindu creation, but may be considered as part of the Indo-European Pantheon. In this connection it will suffice to call attention to the position held by Minos among the Grecian deities, and to the fact that Tacitus relates of the Germans that they have songs which proclaim Tuisto, an autochthonous deity, and his son Mannus, to be the founders of their race.

In the Veda I will refer only to the exhaustive article of Muir in the first volume of his Sanskrit Texts, and to the essay of Roth in the sixth volume of the German Oriental Journal, to show that in their ancient literature the Hindus regarded Manu as the father of their race, that they often looked upon him as upon a Prometheus who first gave them fire, and that the idea they seem to have formed of this personage (whom Roth proves to have been a myth) was that of a semi-divine seer, occasionally regarded as primeval man, occasionally as the originator (after the flood) of a new race, occasionally as a divine and superhuman being.

In the Brāhmaṇas we have stories related of Manu, such as his dividing his inheritance and the like, with some attempt at furnishing him with a family, but without any of the later

thought which presented him as a law-giver—this I think having originated from the circumstance that his reputed acts (such as the division of property) were first quoted as authoritative precedent; and then, with the growth of legal literature, the primeval man, whose acts were thus quoted, grew into a personal authority on legal points, whose words on law (of course invented) attained the influence which citations from such an eminent authority would naturally induce.

The law-Sūtras (keeping 'law' as the most general, and at times most fitting translation for *dharma*) were those earliest attempts at collecting the rules on duty of every sort, which in their prose form were the base of the later metrical *cāstra*. It does not appear to be the case that all *sūtra* literature developed into the metrical form at the same time, nor does it seem probable that the development into the later metrical form in any way suppressed the technical and too concise abbreviations of law and duty which for the sake of convenience were put originally into the short prose rules of the Sūtras. They may have existed side by side.

QUOTATIONS FROM MANU IN THE SŪTRAS.

The following contains all the matter quoted directly from Manu in four of the oldest Sūtras:

1. In Gautama, the oldest *dharma-sūtra* we possess (so far as the matter it contains goes), we find one reference to Manu as a seer of Vedic hymns (RV. viii. 27-21). Of Manu as law-giver there is but one mention, xxi. 7, in which the mere name "Manu" is put at the end of a list of inexpiable crimes, to indicate that he is regarded as authority for the statement—which, in fact, agrees with the sentiment of the Manu-treatise in xi. 90-92, 104-105, although no direct quotation is intended. It is to be remarked, however, that while the Mānava-treatise, by imposing a penalty resulting in death, implies that there is no expiation, it makes a formal statement to this effect only in the case of one of the three crimes, that of killing a Brahman.

2. In Baudhāyana's law-treatise we have one reference (ii. 3. 2) to Manu taken out of the Brahmanical literature: "Manu divided his property among his children" (Taitt. Saṁh. iii. 1. 9⁴); where Manu is not quoted as a law-giver, but as a sage whose act is worthy of imitation. Besides this reference, we find two quotations from Manu as an authority, the first in iv. 1. 13, where it is said Manu declared (that the father incurs) a mortal sin at each appearance of the menses (if he does not give his daughter in marriage at the right time). This might be the construction of Vas. xvii. 71, or of Yāj. i. 64, where it is said that the father incurs thereby the guilt of slaughtering an embryo; but in our Mānava-treatise it is only said that the father is blamable (*vācyā*). Gautama also in the parallel passage (xviii. 22) says

merely that the father is faulty (*dosi*). The second quotation says that Manu declared the *aghamarṣana* penance as effectual in removing sin as a horse-sacrifice—which, in effect, is so stated to be the case in our Mānava-treatise, xi. 260–261, a quotation copied by Vasiṣṭha as from Manu, but by the older Gautama declared without authority for the statement (xxiv. 10).

3. In Āpastamba's work we find also only a reference to Manu dividing his property (ii. 14. 11), in a passage controverting the view advanced by Baudhāyana in regard to dividing an estate; and (in ii. 16. 1) a statement that Manu revealed the ceremony for the dead (*grāddha*).

4. In Vasiṣṭha, the last of these, on the other hand, we have several references to Manu, some of which agree only in sentiment, some verbally, with our Manu-treatise. Now it appears to me that there is an interesting difference in the way in which his quotations are made. I notice that whenever we have a citation from Manu introduced by the words “Manu said,” there can be found no verse in our Mānava-treatise exactly corresponding to it, but only either a complete variation in sense or a merely general agreement with the sense of our Mānava-treatise—except in one instance (iv. 6), where the verse ending “Manu said” is itself incorporated (together with the “Manu said”) into our text; on the other hand, whenever Vasiṣṭha gives a quotation which answers exactly to some verse in our present Mānava-treatise, he always introduces it with the words “now they relate on this point a Manavan verse” (*mānavān cā tra glokam udāharanti*). Let us examine the citations in detail. To begin with those of the first sort, we find the following: In i. 17, Vasiṣṭha declares that “Manu said” the (peculiar) laws of country, caste, and family may be followed on points where there is no revealed text to decide the case (Gaut. xi. 20; Āp. ii. 15). The words here used (*abrahīn Manuh*) are only authorized by the sense of the Mānava-treatise in vii. 203; viii. 41, 46: “Let (the king) make authoritative the laws of those (he has conquered) as declared;” “A king who knows the right should cause his law to be established, after inspecting the laws of the (different) castes and country-folks, and the laws of guilds and families;” “Whatever is practiced by good and virtuous Brahmans let the king ordain (as law, if) not opposed to (the laws of) districts, families, and castes.”

In xi. 23 we find, among several verses which Vasiṣṭha quotes from general hearsay, one “Manu said” verse (immediately after a “Yama said” verse), in respect to the disposal of food left over at a *grāddha*, something like M. iii. 245–6; and on comparing it with our Mānava-treatise, we find it not the same exactly, though resembling it in form: in fact, the point at issue, the disposal of the food, is quite different. We note too that while our treatise ends with “they say,” Vasiṣṭha also has *iti sthitih*, though the whole is given from Manu.

In xii. 16, after the rule “by water and hand let him cleanse the vessel” (*udakapāñibhyām parimṛjyāt kamandalum*), we

have the statement “Manu Prajāpati calls this (way of cleansing) encircling with fire,” in which this statement is only part of a quotation, without more authority than is implied by the words “they repeat (these verses).” This might answer to the purification by hand or water enjoined in our treatise v. 116, but there is there no such appellation as “encircling with fire” given to this means of cleansing, such as is here said to be the definition of Manu (*paryagnikaranam hy etan Manur āha Prajāpatih*).

In xxiii. 43, we find the statement that Manu, chief among the supporters of the law, invented the *cīcukr̥chra* (‘child’s penance’), which is then described; but in our Manu-treatise the penance by this name is not the same; for Vasistha’s penance seems compounded of (M. xi. 220) the Mānava-treatise’s “child-penance” and “Prajāpati-penance” (M. xi. 212). Sufficient for us is the fact that nothing in our treatise answers to this statement.

In xxvi. 8, we have a verse like Baudh. iv. 2. 15, quoted above, in regard to the *aghamarsana* (M. xi. 260–261), which, being a “Manu ‘said’” verse, would seem to contradict the rule. This quotation, however, is in a chapter of which Prof. Bühler says “its genuineness is not above suspicion” (Introd. Vas. p. xvi.); so that it is to be regarded as doubtful.

In iv. 6 is the one apparent exception noted above, but explained by the fact that the verse, just as it stands in Vasistha, occurs in our Mānava-treatise also as quoted from Manu (v. 41). It is found in a passage which, all taken together, is not an exception, but an example of the practice I have noted as occurring whenever the verses given correspond exactly to our treatise; for this verse is only part of the quotation Vasistha gives. The quotation begins with the second formula, *mānava*, ‘a Manavan passage is now given;’ and this, according to the usage I have indicated, ought to contain words found in our text. Accordingly, we find verse 6=M. v. 41, verse 7=M. v. 48, while verses 5 and 8, with which the quotation begins and ends, are in prose, not in metrical form like verses 6 and 7: or, in other words, as Prof. Bühler points out, a veritable remnant of the old Mānava-sūtra in its prose form, before it became metrified. This then is the first example of a true quotation (according to the standard of our text) from the Mānava-treatise, and it is introduced as a whole, not by “Manu said,” but by *mānava*.

The next quotation of this sort is in iii. 2 (*mānavāṁ cā 'tra glokam udāharanti*), ‘they relate this Manavan verse;’ and then follows a verse which we have in our Mānava-treatise at ii. 168.

The next (xiii. 16) is introduced in the same way (*mānavāṁ cā 'tra glokam udāharanti*), and reads as follows: *phalāny āpas tilān bhaksān yac cā 'nyac chrāddhikam bhavet: pratigrhyā 'py anadyāyah pānyāsyā brāhmaṇāḥ smṛtāḥ*. This is the verse which, with some *var. lec.*, we find in our text at iv. 117, the verse being evidently the same, loosely quoted, with the substitution of a

general for a particular enumeration in the first part. There is here no difference of substance.

The next verse (xix. 37) has the same formula at the beginning (*mānavam* etc.), but is in the *trīṣṭubh* metre, a metre in which probably a good many of the Manavan verses were originally written; so that it would be impossible to find the same verse in our treatise, which is composed in another and shorter metre; all that we can expect is a verse like it; and this we find in x. 120, although, in shortening the verse to adapt it to its present metre, part of the original has been omitted.

The next verse (xx. 18) has this formula also, and equals xi. 152 of our text. Now, counting out the suspicious verse xxvi. 8, we find that there are five quotations introduced as *mānava*, and that they all correspond with verses in our Mānava-treatise, the correspondence being in three of them verbatim, and the other two being exact in so far as the sense of one verse in our treatise answers precisely to each one given by Vasiṣṭha; while the difference of form in one of the two is explained by a change of metre, and the difference of form of the other, though considerable, does not alter the sense, the whole answering to one verse in our treatise. On the other hand, we find that there are five quotations introduced by "Manu said," and that none of them corresponds to any one verse of our Mānava-treatise; the lack of correspondence consisting in this: that one of them (xii. 16) has nothing like it in our treatise; that another of them (xxiii. 43) describes a penance mentioned in our treatise, but as something different from the one called by the same name in our treatise; that the third (xi. 23) is like in form to one of the verses in our treatise, but decides the point differently; that the fourth (i. 17) only expresses the combined sentiment of three verses of our treatise, and then adds something not in our text: while the fifth "quotation from Manu" (iv. 6) is properly only a portion of a longer *mānava* quotation in which the same verse occurs as that still preserved in our Mānava-treatise as a "Manu said" verse.

The significance of this difference I shall remark upon at the end of this paper.

QUOTATIONS FROM MANU IN THE INSCRIPTIONS.

In the interesting grant of land under Dhruvasena I., where we find that a Vaisnava king has a niece who founds a Buddhist monastery, we read this inscription: "He who steals land is guilty of the five great sins and the minor sins; and on this point there is a verse by Vyāsa, saying, 'He who steals land etc. incurs the guilt of the killer of one hundred thousand cows.'" Before this we find the following description of King Dronasimha: *manvādipranītavidhividhānadharma dharmarāja iva*: i. e., 'He followed the rules laid down by Manu and others.' This inscription dates back to the middle of the sixth century A. D., (Gupta) *sāvivat* 207 (Ind. Antiq. iv. pp. 104, 105). In a Cera grant (Ind. Ant. v. p. 133) of 513 A. D., we find *api cā 'tra*

Manugītāh clokah ('there is a verse sung by Manu'); and this verse says that he who steals land passes 6,000 years in "horrible darkness." A Pallava inscription (ib. p. 154) gives the usual verses as "verses of the seers" (*ārsāh clokāh*). In the three Vallabhi grants (ib. p. 205), *suīnvat* 207, grantee a student of the Atharva-Veda, we have *atra Vyāsagītāh cloko bhavati* ('there is a verse sung by Vyāsa'); and this also gives 6,000 years of hell to him who deprives one of land or consents thereto (*ācchettā, anumantā*), while the giver lives as long in heaven. Vyāsa is also the reputed author in the Gujarat grant, *çak.* 380 (Ind. Ant. v. p. 109). The Pallava grant of the fifth century (ib. p. 50-51) has a more legal look, in that it says the thief deserves corporal punishment (fourth Plate); the rest is like the Cera grant: *yaç ce 'dam asmacchāsanam atikrāmet sa pāpaç gārīradandam arhati; api cā 'pi clokāh: bhūmidānāt param dānam na bhūtām na bhavisyati, tasyai 'va haranapāpān na bhūtām na bhavisyati; svadattām* (etc.) . . . *gavām catasahasrasya hantuh pibati duskr̥tam.* In the Dhruvasena grant first quoted, it will be noticed that there is a slight difference (*hantuh prāpnoti klibisam*), while the words are there given to Vyāsa. This verse on land-stealing was then common property, always the same in general tendency, but varying in particulars. For instance (in Ind. Ant. iv. p. 327), we have a very late one giving the usual verses as to the 6,000 years in ordure for the land-thief, and ending "as many particles of dust as a Brahman's tears gather up when he is deprived of property, so many years the kings who take it will pass in the pot-cooking hell" (*kumbhīpāka*: both the general tenor and the hell are known in the Manu-treatise; other names occur, as *rauram* in vi. 56). A Cālukya inscription (ib. viii. p. 97), of the early part of the seventh century A.D., gives the verse "by many has the earth been enjoyed" etc. (something like this at the end of the Cera grant quoted above, "earth enjoyed by Sagara and others") thus: *Manugītām clokam udāharanti*, 'they relate a verse sung by Manu.' It is not Manu alone, nor Vyāsa alone; even Brahmā (Pallava grant, viii. p. 168) gives utterance to these verses. The Vyāsa verse has sometimes the expression "born in ordure"—as e. g., Dyn. Rāstrakūta, *çak.* 675 (ib. xi. p. 109), or the Cālukya inscription (iii. p. 305) of 566 A.D. The latter is as follows:

*bahubhir vasudhā dattā bahubhiç cā 'nupālitā :
yasya yasya yadā bhūmis tasya tasya tadā phalam.
svadattām paradattām vā yatnād raksa Yudhisthira :
mahir mahikṣitām gres̥ham dānāc chreyo 'nupālanam.
svadattām paradattām vā yo hareta vasundharām :
gvavishthāyām kṛmir bhūtvā pitṛbhīḥ saha majjati. Vyāsagītāh
clokāh.—(cf. Ins. in ii. 156).*

Now this long quotation from the epic Vyāsa is oddly enough in that inscription of the Cālukyas which describes the king Mangalīvara as born in the family of *Çrīsvāmipādānudhyā-tānām Mānavyāsagotrānām Hāritiputrānām Cālkyānām* (cf.

vii. p. 161 ff., the inscription which says the Cālikyas, the same who are also called Cālukyas, or Calkyas, are *Mānava-sa-gotrāḥ Hāritī-putrāḥ*, and conversant with the following works: *Mānava-Purāṇa-Rāmāyana-Bhāratetihāsa*, a grant made anterior to the separation of the East and West Cālukyas, a little after 500 *gāka*-era, or toward the end of the sixth century A. D., ending “and it is declared in the *dharma-śāstra* that the earth was enjoyed by many, etc.,” and declaring Bṛhaspati to be the model knower of *nīti*, or kingly policy). It is to be noticed that the quotation is not made here from any Mānava code, and that the latter is not appealed to at all, though the Cālukyas especially speak of themselves as adherents of the laws given by “Manu and others.” For instance, in a Cāluhya grant of about 668 A. D., the King Viṣṇuvardhana is described as *Manvādi-praṇitadharmaçāstrapracaritasarvalokāgrayah* (‘the refuge of all the world, as has been inculcated by the *dharma-śāstra* laid down by Manu and others’). Compare the inscription (Ind. Ant. vi. 85 ff.) of the West Cālukyas, and that (ib. vii. 302) of the year 694-5 A. D. These quotations are not unique, and might be multiplied. A quotation from Manu as long as any meets us in the grant on the Nāgamangala plate of king Kongani for a Jain temple:

api cā 'tra *Manu-gītāḥ* clokāḥ :
svadattām *paradattām* vā yo hareta *vasundharām* :
sastivarsasahasrāni *viṣṭhāyām* jāyate *krmiḥ*.
svām dātuṁ (?) *sumahac chakyām* *duhkham* anyasya *pālanam* :
dānām vā *pālanām* ve 'ti *dānāc chreyo* 'nupālanam.
bahubhir *vasudhā bhuktā rājabhiḥ* *Sagarādibhiḥ* :
yasya yasya yadā bhunis *tasya tasya tatpālanam*.
devasvām tu *viṣām* *ghoram* na *viṣām* *viṣām* *ucyate* :
viṣām *ekākinam* *hanti* *devasvam* *putrapautrakam*.

The date of this grant is 777 A. D. (Ind. Ant. ii. 159). The similarity with the like verses of Vyāsa is apparent. We find such verses as these on nearly all the grants. The form and order varies, and sometimes the words—as in the Cera grant quoted above we have instead of *viṣṭhāyām* etc. the words *ghore tamasi*, or the ending changes entirely into another formula:

abhidattām *tribhir* *bhuktām* *śadbhiç* *ca* *pratipālanam* :
etāni na *nirvartanti* *pūrvarājākṛtāni* *ca*.

Preceding these we generally have the statement that he who steals land is guilty of the five great sins. The connection of the (East) Cālukyas was not merely the connection with the Mānava (this we find quite often, e. g. in Pl. I. of the Kṛṣṇa district grant, Ind. Ant. ii. 175), but they also claim that the first king of the Solar race was the “Mānava, born of the Self-existent,” who was saved in an ark at the time of the deluge (ib. Pl. III.). The Vallabhī grants generally quote Vyāsa (see above, and compare Ind. Ant. vii. 70 and other cases), and he is quoted in the Dhruvāsena grant alluded to above; so that, although we often have these

verses given without any authority for them, it is perhaps he who is intended by the “Smṛtikāra” alluded to in the Morbi copper plates (Ind. Ant. ii. 257), of the sixth century (*samvat* 585): “Reflecting on the declaration of Vyāsa and others about the five great sins, one should recall the word of Smṛtikāra;” for this “word” is the same as that which occurs often under his name (ācchettā etc. . . . *hantuh prāpnoti kilbisam*), although those granting it are “given to the study of the Maitrāyanīya” school. In the very late inscription from Gaddak (Ind. Ant. ii. 300) which is, according to Fleet, “about four hundred years old,” we find after the verses *svadattām* etc. the statement whoever injures land given to another—

so labdho vārunaih pāçaih kṣipyate pūyaçonite;
and *kulāni tārayet kartā sapta sapta ca sapta ca:*
 adho ‘dhah pātayed dhartā sapta sapta ca sapta ca;

and the remark that “there would be expiation for one who slew a cow or a Brahman, even at the holy watering-places, but there would be no expiation for men who should steal the property of gods or Brahmans.” The authority given is “the great seers, Manu and others.” This is utterly opposed to our Manu-treatise.

Now in our Mānava-treatise there is only one verse remotely suggested by all these quotations. In xi. 26 we read: “That evil-minded man lives in the next world on a vulture’s leavings, who through greed injures the possessions of gods or Brahmans.” The gist of it all is in the Brahmā (*gitāh*) verses found in the Mahābhārata xii. 136. 2: “The property of those accustomed to sacrifice should never be taken away, nor the property of the gods; (but) a Kṣatriya has a right (*arhati*) to take from Dasyus and from those without sacrifices.” These are general rules in regard to property. Of land our treatise says (viii. 99): “(A witness) on speaking an untruth regarding land destroys everything;” and (xi. 58) “Theft of land is called equal to theft of gold.” In other words, nothing from the Mānava-treatise as we now possess it could have given rise to these lengthy quotations from Manu; and the fact that they are often ascribed to Vyāsa as well as to Manu points to the real worth of this Father Manu. The (prose) Sūtra of Gautama (xiii. 17) says of stealing land that “Hell (is the punishment) for a theft of land;” and Baudhāyanī (ii. 1. 2. 26) makes him who sells sesamum be “born again as a worm and plunged in dogs’ ordure.” The tone, then, of the quotation is antique; but I fancy it never was in the Mānava-treatise. In these inscriptions, dating probably centuries after the Sūtra we have quoted above, we first find the Mānava-treatise attaining a prominence (in being placed at the head of the list of treatises referred to) which is as conspicuous as the inaccuracy of the quotations from the individual Manu.

MANU IN THE MAHĀBHĀRATA.

When Medhātithi, the oldest existing commentator on Manu, declares that a verse in the law-book contradictory to other verses is "not a verse of Manu,"* and in another place (iv. 103) suggests that the mention of Manu as author of a verse is merely to add weight to its utterance, while it is really nothing but "an old verse," he shows a sagacity seldom equaled by Hindu commentators. His acumen was not at fault. It is only a pity that he did not exercise it more often. His words I take as the text to the following discussion, which has for its object the laws ascribed to Manu by the compilers of the Mahābhārata. It is the personal Manu referred to in the epic which comes here into consideration—not the quotations from our Mānava-dharma-çāstra, but those verses which are declared to be from Manu by the addition of the endorsement "Manu said so," or "Manu, son of the Self-existent, said so."[†]

To these citations from Manu are prefixed a few introductory remarks regarding the sources of all law as professedly held by the Mahābhārata.

First, in regard to the frequent terms *dharma* and *çāstram*: *dharma*, which the writer in his translation of Manu prefers to render 'a rule of right,' is used for each and both of these ideas; it is a rule of action, a law, right, a spiritual right, a spiritual gain, a duty, the rule of righteous action, *jus*, *lex*, *privilegium*; *çāstram* is the treatise; containing a discussion of right, rights, etc., it is a *dharmaçāstram*.

In the Mahābhārata, as in the Mānava-treatise, the idea of *dharma* is generally that of a rule of right conformable to usage and based on it (*acūrasambhavo dharmah*: iii. 150. 28): that is to say, on such usage as is sanctioned by the good (*santah*), who are distinguished on the one hand from such home-bred sinners as "hold the Vedas to be of no account," "slight the treatises" (*çāstrānām abhilañghanam*), and talk merely "to murder" these treatises (*vadhāya*: xiii. 37, *passim*); and, on the other hand, from such base foreigners as the Vāhikas, the shameless habits of whose women are severely censured (viii. 44. 10 ff.), and the laxity of whose caste-order reaches such a pitch that even barbers become Brahmans (ib. 45. 3 ff.); or as the Madras people, whose "virtues" are said to be "all vices" (ib. 45. 29); for the knowledge of the Hindus had now extended over "many countries ripe with varied laws" (ib. 3), probably including many people even more remote than the mixed Greeks (Yavanas), who are described as "all-knowing and particularly brave" (ib. 36). *Dharma* is briefly sketched (xii. 260. 16 ff.) in these words: "Remembered

* *amānava 'yam çlokah*: ix. 93.

† *Manur abravit; Manuh svāyambhuvo 'bravit.*

usage is eternal law (not all usage; for) if bad usages are introduced, law becomes mere quack; the only law to follow is that long ago enjoined by the seers, (for) in following all sorts of usages there can only result a lack of close attention to usage in general" (*anaikāgryam*). Along with the seers, the *dharma* "declared by the *Veda*," or "the authority of the *Veda*" (*vedotah, crutipramāṇah*), is often referred to; but it is nevertheless a variable and uncertain thing in many particulars, as declared by different experts (*cistāh*), being subject to change according to the customs of different districts, and multiform as the castes, guilds, and families which have established it (*jāti, creni, kula*, xii. 36. 19; *decajātikulānām dharmajñah*, xii. 54. 20). It is enveloped in much uncertainty, if we judge by its being so often called "subtile" (*sūkṣma*), or spoken of in like language. For instance: "dharma is subtile, its course we know not," i. 195. 29; "because of the subtilty of dharma," ib. 196. 11: see other remarks of the same sort in ii. 37. 3; ib. 67. 38; v. 36. 71; ii. 69. 14; ib. 73. 4. It is "hard to understand" (iii. 206. 41: cf. vii. 198. 44 and 42); nevertheless, when it is known it is not to be doubted, for "as a Cūdra departs from the *Veda*, so does one depart from the world if he question a rule of right" (iii. 31. 8). Other quotations will be found on this point in the Indian Antiquary, vi. 269 (J. Muir). The rule (iii. 52. 15) "not to destroy the paths of dharma" (*mā dharmyān ninaçah pathah*: cf. *gāstrapathayukta*) is enlarged by the juxtaposition of the three aims of life, right, wealth, and desire, the first of which is to be especially cultivated (iii. 33. 40, *gāstraprāktō vidhīh*). The paramount authority is the rule of the seers, the fathers of old whose customs have become law (*ārṣam prāmāṇam*, iii. 31. 22: cf. 23, and 24: "dharma is a ship, the only one for those embarked like merchants in search of the highest gain"). If any further local habitation is given this *dharma*, it is in the *Ārya*-*gāstra* (iii. 30. 41); and, though it has its mysteries (*dharmarahasya*, xii. 37. 7), they can nevertheless be learned, as well as its commentary (*dharmaṁ savaiyākhyam prāptavān*, ib. 10).*

Even with this understanding of *dharma*, we find that there is no great unanimity in regard to deciding what set of rules is to be followed. Some, it is said (xii. 142. 7 ff.), "regard as binding only the ordinary practices of the world (*lokayātrā*); this, they say, is *dharma*;" "a declaration of *dharma* is given neither by the voice nor by the understanding;" with these words the Blessed one himself proclaimed the law (viz: the *Bārhaspatyañi-jñānam*); "one should modify† the law inculcated by the good;" "the law for a king is not laid down by the law contained in any one treatise (*nai'kaçāstrena dharmena rājño dharmo vidhīyate*);"

* *Dharma* as personified Genius of Right holds his ordinary position in the pantheon of the Mahābhārata, though he is sometimes shamefully treated: e.g. cursed and born as a Cūdra (i. 63. 96; cf. 108. 15).

† *ūheta*: not as used in *Visnu* xxi. 2 (*mantrān ūhet*), of a mere formal change of mantras to suit a ceremonial need.

cf. ib. 14 (*pari musnanti gāstrāni gāstradosānudarśinah*), and iii. 312. 18 (*crutayo vibhinnā nai'ko munir yasya matam pramānam*, etc.). So (in iii. 307. 15), a usage is not settled by appeal to any standard of laws, but is the “natural condition” (*svabhāva esa lokānām*); and again, we read in regard to a certain act, “some call it the rule given by revelation, some say no; we do not demur, for all is not settled” (*na hi sarvam vidhiyate*: xii. 109. 13). The general result is important: one must act as well as he can in accordance with old customs, but at the present time there is no one paramount authority recognized.

Where then are the individual law-makers? What position does Manu hold? We find many authorities cited by name, but none of these are decisive utterances; the law-givers appear at intervals with a verse or two, which gives additional force to a law perhaps just laid down; or their opinions are divergent, and are quoted against each other; nay, even the speaker has a sentiment of his own, which he flings into the mass of quotations he has been giving from the old law-makers, with a defiant “but I think so and so,” “but my opinion is this.” When the law-treatises are formally quoted, there is apparently no one of them thought of as supreme, and these treatises are mentioned chiefly in the later books. A quotation is made (xii. 291. 14) by Parāçara from those who know and declare the utterances of the *Veda* (*brahmaçāstrajña, brahmavādin*); and he then adds his own opinion, with a “but I,” and gives it in full (*brahmaçāstra* is in 287. 41 *brahmadharma*); “the twice-born verses in revelation declare the Vaidehaka to be a Çūdra, (but) I see” etc. (xii. 296. 28); “a Çūdra woman (is not a legal wife, but) may be a mistress; other men say no to this” (xiii. 44. 12). Absolute alone is family law (*kuladharma*), and not to be violated. The “subtle *dharma*-treatises” (v. 140. 7) may be all based on rules maintaining the “usage practiced by the ancients” (*pūrvair ācarito janaiḥ*, iii. 5. 97), but the laws of the family take precedence over all others. Like the expression used above of family law is that in iv. 5. 33; and in i. 113. 11, where a king who has just demanded (contrary to the Manu-treatise) a price for his daughter exclaims, “our highest authority is the law of the family;” and again, ib. 9, “I am unable to alter what has been established in this family, be it bad or good.” Such laws are eternal, and “hell is the portion of men who have set aside the laws of the family” (*utsan-nakuladharmañām manusyānām narake niyatam vāso bhavatī 'ty anuçucruma*: vi. 25. 40). We know better than the later Hindus how much family or clan law had to do with the making of the law-treatises; but it is well to note the deference paid to it, in distinction from any legal “code,” at the time of compilation of the epic.

Without prejudice, I can perceive no especial distinction awarded to any one explainer of *dharma* among the many whose works have made the various treatises. Manu sometimes heads the list, as if preëminent, but sometimes not, as if not. There is

certainly no tendency whatever to refer to a code of Manu as to an ultimate authority, although that authority is, together with that of others, recognized. Were we to compare the authorities deduced by the Mahābhārata with those referred to by the Manu-treatise, it would seem in general that we have no further advancement in the former than is represented by the standpoint of the latter. In most cases we are simply referred to "rules declared by devotees" (e. g. iii. 208. 14), to "the ordinances of the old" (iii. 209. 2), or to "a decision among the *dharma*s" (v. 178. 51); still more precisely, but vague, "the old explainers of decisions" (*niçcitatadarçinah*, v. 63. 9). These are the "authorities" which settle the "subtile course of law which has many branches and no end" (*bahuçākha . . . anantikā*). The Manu-treatise has a whole chapter on the duties of a king; but in the long discourse on that subject in the epic, Manu is mentioned only three or four times, and there are no more quotations attributed to him than to other law-givers. The king should follow the treatises on polity or the polity of punishment (i. 145. 21; iii. 150. 30, *et passim*); but the "rules of the skilled," "the *dharma* joined to rule," the "custom of good men," etc., etc., sum up most of the cases where any authority is deferred to (cf. iii. 207. 62 ff.). It may be said, however, that this is the general custom; and for this reason I attempt no *argumentum a silentio* based on the vast number of verses identical with those in the Manu-treatise but not referred to it, or sometimes referred elsewhere. Still, in bringing forward those actually quoted from Manu, it is necessary to speak of this point, lest one forget what a small portion of the verses apparently taken from the Mānava-treatise is accredited to Manu. There was in these portions of the work no Vaisnavic influence at work (as in Viṣṇu), suppressing the name of Manu entirely, or it would have been carried out to the end as there. It seems to me, too, when we see so many verses containing the gist of Mānava verses, but altered in form to such an extent that the whole verse-structure has been inverted, that an unbiased observer would naturally conclude that neither verse is the result of an attempt to reproduce the other, but that legal saws and maxims were couched in such general language and in such plastic swinging verse-form as to be handed down merely as a whole, while the various texts were due to the idiosyncracies of the reciter, who changed the form of the text as it happened to come to his mind. *Āstra*-language is not *sūtra*-language. I fancy they did not lay much stress on exactness of word-arrangement in these epic rehearsals. In fact, there are plenty of instances where the same verse appears in the Mahābhārata under several different forms, although all pretend to be quotations from one original version. They did not quote, they paraphrased. The form of a Manu-verse found in the epic may, therefore, be as old as that preserved for us by the (much later) earliest commentator to Manu; the verses of the latter often appear as *tristubh* metre in the epic.

Those who fancy that a Mānava-code (even an older recension) was in any way a paramount authority at the time of the Mahābhārata may explain as they can the following passages opposed to text and spirit of the Mānava-treatise now existing. In i. 29. 18 ff.: *vibhāgam bahavo mohāt (!) kartum icchanti . . .* (but as division weakens forces) *tasmād vibhāgam bhratīṇām na praçānsanti sādhavah*—an irreverent way of alluding to M. viii. 111. In i. 113. 12, Bhīṣma says that to give marriage-money is no sin, but is, on the contrary, a law declared by the Self-existent. In v. 34. 49, we are told that the chief food of the rich is meat. In ii. 56. 36, it is declared that the ancients used to conduct business by gambling, and it was no sin. In i. 122. 3-9 we read: “the law now observed among the Kurus in the north regarding adultery has been but recently established (*na cirān māryāde 'yam . . . shāpitā*), and before this it was the eternal law for women to be in the same position as cattle, and not secluded at all” (see the whole adhy.). Polyandry (*bahūnām ekapatnītā*) is “eternal law” (i. 197, end).

I come now to Manu himself. God, creator, demi-god, king, and law-maker—these are his rôles. In detail:

1. As purely mythical and mystic form of the god Agni, in iii. 221. 4: *Agni cā 'pi Manu-nāma prājāpatyam akārayat*; and (ib. 8) *tapaç ca Manum putram bhānum cā 'py Angirah srjat* (9) *bṛhadbhānum tu tam prāhuh*; in verse 17, his second son is Viçvapati.

2. As demi-god, along with deities and sages, in ix. 45. 17, with Pulasta, Pulaha, Atri, etc. (cf. M. i. 35), we find a Manu (10) accompanying the gods as they assembled at a consecration and gave gifts.

In connection with the periods (*manvantara*), in xii. 349. 42: *tena bhinnās tadā nedā Manoh svāyambhuve 'ntare*; (in 55) *bhavisyati Manur mahnā*; (in 56) *tasmin manvantare Manvā-digānapūrvakah*. These periods of the Manus have protecting influence: “May the wives of the gods, the daughters of the gods, the mothers of the gods, and the Manu-periods . . . protect thee” (xiii. 14. 38-40). The Harivānsa has more of this (200-400).

3. As god and creator, Manu appears in i. 75. 14 and preceding: “Manu is the originator of the race, therefore man is so called.” He has sons, and, more particularly, the Brahmans, Kṣatriyas, and others were born of him (the German Mannus has likewise three sons assigned him, clan-names of peoples). Yama is the brother of Manu; and, from v. 117. 8 ff., Sarasvatī is his wife: “The king-seer lived as happily with his wife as Agastya with the Vaidarbī, Brhaspati with Tārā, Manu with Sarasvatī, Dusyanta with Cakuntalā, Nala with Damayanti.” Secondary creators, the eight *prakṛtayah*, include Manu (as above, under demi-god); here (xii. 340. 34) the list runs Marīci, Angiras, Atri, Pulasta, Pulaha, Kratu, Vasiṣṭha, Manu Svāyambhuva—where the last takes perhaps the place of Bhṛgu in the Manu-treatise. In a scene where punishment is personified as an active power,

we have various synonyms of Danda ('rod, punishment'), among which are Asi ('sword': v. below), and *Manur jyesthah*, the oldest mortal or Manu. The origin of Danda also brings in Manu (xii. 122. 36 ff.) as half divinity, but concerned with penal laws; and it is interesting in furnishing a line of succession different from the ordinary: "Mahādeva gave the rod, the guardian of law (*dandam dharmasya goptāram*), to Viṣṇu; he, to Angiras; he, to Indra and Marīci (dual); Marīci gave it to Bhṛgu, who gave it to the seers; these gave it to the world-protectors; and these again to Kṣupa; "now Kṣupa gave it to Manu" (*Kṣupas tu Manave prādād ādityatanayāya ca*). If this is an attempt to trace the course of penal law, it puts Manu after Bhṛgu; elsewhere Kṣupa, here brought into close connection with Manu, is father of Manu's descendant, Ikṣvāku. We may compare with this account that in xii. 166. 28 ff.: "When the demons disregarded the barrier of the law (*dharma-setu*) given by God, the Lord produced the sword and subdued them; then he gave the sword, the guardian of law (*asim dharmasya goptāram*) to Viṣṇu; he, to Marīci; he, to the great seers; they, to Vāsava, and Mahendra to the world-protectors; they, to Manu Sūryaputra ('Sun's son'), addressing him thus: 'Thou art lord of mortals; protect thy descendants by the sword (of proper punishment) which is born of *dharma* (*asinā dharmagarbhena*).'" Manu afterwards gave it to his son, Kṣupa; he gave it to Ikṣvāku, etc. etc." (In 84 the eight mystic names of the Sword are given, and in 82 the Pleiads are said to be its constellation, and Agni its divinity: cf. above, where Manu is Agni, and see BR. s. *kṛttikā*.) The same list of Manus as given above is in this section found (16) in a modified form as sons of God, with the Manu omitted. The law which the demons disregarded prior to Manu's appearance was the Veda-given law promulgated by the world's grandfather (*vedapāthito dharmah*); in it rest the gods, demigods, Bhṛgu, Atri, Angiras, ... Vasiṣṭha, Gautama, Agastya, Nārada, and others (21, 22). Cf. xiii. 26. 4, Atri, Vasiṣṭha, Bhṛgu, etc. In xiii. 166 we find a list of seers in which Manu Prajāpati comes almost at the end, after Bhṛgu, Angiras, Gautama, Atri, Vasiṣṭha, and many others. Cf. also xiii. 14. 397: "Seven Manus ... and Bhṛgu, Dakṣa, etc., preceded by Marīci etc." We must not forget that, in spite of their divine nature, Vasiṣṭha, Atri, Angiras (?), Gautama, Nārada, were veritable law-givers, and the treatises bearing their names are standard works. It may be remarked that the history of creation related in this chapter from 1 ff. bears a certain resemblance to the spurious five verses that stand at the beginning of our Mānava-treatise (though of course not referred to it); and another account (xii. 182. 8) refers the relation to Bhṛgu, who tells it to Bharadvāja, beginning much in the style of the opening verses in the Manu-treatise (*Bhṛgunā bhihitān cāstram*).

The family of this divine Manu seems to be a little mixed. I have already noticed his wife Sarasvatī, his son Kṣupa, and his grandson Ikṣvāku. The last was one of those who obeyed the

laws of his grandfather respecting food, abstained from eating meat, and went to heaven for his goodness (xiii. 115). In xiii. 2. 5, he is the son of Manu Prajāpati, and has a hundred sons himself. In the passage quoted above from i. 75, we find that, though Manu gives his name to mankind, he is not the first originator of beings, as he is the son of Mārtanda; but after noting the Mānavas (men) in the race of Manu (*Manor vanę mānavāḥ*: cf. ii. 19. 6, *mānava vanę*) as coming from him in general, we have Veda, Dhṛṣṇu, Narisyanta, Nābhāga, Ikṣvāku, Kārūṣa, Cāryāti, Ilā, Prasadhra, Nābhāgāriṣṭa, as his ten special children, along with "fifty others, who, as we hear, all went to destruction by mutual slaughter" (*anyonyabhedāt*). According to the Purāṇas, this Ilā was a son and a daughter, time and time about. A somewhat altered list, with a fuller account of these sons, is found in the Viṣṇu Purāṇa, iv. 1. The name of the tenth son is variously spelled.

In xiv. 4. 2, Kṣupa is the grandson, and two generations intervene between Manu and Ikṣvāku: "There was in the Kṛta age (the Golden age) a Manu Dandadharma Prabhu, and his son was Prasandhi, father of Kṣupa, and his great-grandson was Ikṣvāku, who had one hundred sons, the eldest of whom was Viñča, father of Vivīča" etc. (*Viñčasya putrah kalyāṇo Vivīčo nāma*; not son of Ikṣvāku, as in BR.); while, according to xii. 348. 51, Vivavant gave *dharma* to Manu at the beginning of the Tretā age (Brazen age), and Manu gave it to his son Ikṣvāku. According to xiii. 147. 23 ff., we find Govinda in the family of Manu; and the latter's descendants are given for seven generations, beginning with Anga (*Manoh putrah*), through Antardhāman, Havirdhāman, Prācīnabarhis, down to the ten Pracetosas, Dakṣa Prācetasa (they are given in i. 75, before the account of Manu noted above), and through him and the Dāksāyanyāḥ Ādityāḥ, Manu (*Ādityataḥ*) and (the personification of) Ilā as Manu's daughter (*Manoč ca vanęgājā Ilā*), although some of these are elsewhere subject to different relationships. This Manu too appears to be regarded as identical with the law-giver, from the phrase at the beginning of the list (22), *Prajāpatiye cubhe mārge, mānave dharmasamkṛte*. In the same book (149. 15), as a form of Viṣṇu is found Viçvākarmā Manus Tvaṣṭā (cf. xiii. 16. 22, where Manu is distinct from the creator, while in xiii. 14. 408 he is identical with Kṛṣṇa), and (in 17. 117) the song in praise of Viṣṇu is declared by Bhārgavāḥ (Tandilī) to Gautama, and by him to Manu the son of Vivavant, who is intended in the above genealogy. In vi. 9. 5, *Bhāratam priyam Indrasya devasya, Manor Vaivasvatasya ca*, Manu the son of Vivavant interchanges with son of the Self-existent, as he does even in the law-books. The family of Manu goes back in part to much later (Brāhmaṇa, Nirukta, Sūtra) literature.

This mass of rubbish, chiefly from the latest book of the epic, has little worth or interest, except as showing from the very fact of its position in the whole work that the chief mythology concerning this many-sided Manu is a late product. He is god,

demi-god, and primeval man. In this last rôle, the great fish story (*mātsyakam purāṇam*), relating the *caritam Manor Vai-vasvatasya*, needs only to be referred to (iii. 187. 57). It is a popular version of the old Brahmanic account of the flood, where Manu is Noah. Parallel passages will be found in Muir, vol. i. of Sanskrit Texts.

Passages are not wanting where Manu ceases to have any individuality, and becomes a mere type of the divinity in general, as he is of Agni in the first quotation above: cf. ii. 19. 10: *apari-hāryā meghānām Māgadhā Manunā kṛtāḥ*, '(the Supreme) Manu made them inseparable.' Thus in the philosophical section, xiii. 334. 27 ff., Manu as a Prajāpati is beneath Self (*ātman*). This particular passage is interesting, although the tales representing Manu as originator of laws are so shadowy as to be of slight value. "Nārada spoke to God, saying: 'Day after day men sacrifice to the universal father, mother, and teacher, to Thee, thou who art multiform! But we know not to what God or to what father thou makest sacrifice.' Then God answered: 'Self (soul) it is, or the knower of things (*kṣetrajña*), imperceptible, eternal; it was by Self's command that sacrifice was made to gods and manes; the twenty-one forefathers honor this law, as do Brahmā, Sthānu, Manu, Dakṣa, Bhṛgu, etc.'"

In xiii. 335. 28 ff., there is an indefinite notice of the laws of Manu, where we are on the verge of finding him more law-giver than god: "A treatise embracing *lokadharma* ('world-laws,' of this time) was declared by the seven seers; the creator extolled it (it contained 100,000 verses) as his own (*madanuçāsanam*), and the chief authority of the world; through this shall Manu, son of the Self-existent, declare laws, and Uçanas and Brhaspati, when they are born, shall declare a treatise upheld by your (this) opinion, in the *svāyambhuvesu dharmesu*, and in the treatise of Uçanas and the Brhaspati-matam." Accordingly we find the seers' treatise bestowed first on Brhaspati (along with its branches and Upaniṣads): which reminds us of the Bārhaspatyam (xii. 59. 80 ff.), where Çankara, who first grasped *dandanūti*, reduced it to a *māhāstram* of 10,000 adhy., which Indra subsequently cut down to 5,000, and Brhaspati to 2,000; after which Kāvya diminished it to 1,000 (cf. the similar account in the introductory part of Nārada's law-book). The above is nothing but a puff of the Pāñcarātra sect. It is worth noting, however, that the work of Manu is not here alluded to as a treatise, but as "the laws." Such indefinite allusion occurs again, xii. 267. 36: "Manu, son of the Self-existent, out of pity for his creatures, declared the law, that the great fruit thereof might not perish;" and in xii. 348. 36: "To lay the foundation of *dharma*, Brahmā instructed Manu Svārocisa, through love for the good of the worlds (cf. M. i. 62, first of the seven)." In xiii. 14. 280, we read again of the "Manus beginning with Svāyambhuva," and the "seers beginning with Bhṛgu." A fragment in xii. 36. 1 ff. might almost seem to have served as a model for the (late) introductory verses of our Mānava-

treatise. Vyāsa says: “they tell this ancient tale (Purāna), which is a conversation between the blest and Manu Prajāpati; wherein the seers, coming together, are said to have asked him in regard to the rules of right (*dharmaṃ papracchur āśinam ādikāle Prajāpatim*), and Manu, son of the Self-existent, answered them (*tān evam ukto bhagavān Manuḥ Svāyambhuvo ‘bravīt*), ‘listen to a condensed and extended account of good habits and custom.’”

4. A quaint tale, in which Manu figures as an ancient king on earth elected by a discontented democracy, will form a connecting link between the two characters (of divine being and legislator) which he sometimes bears as distinct in each, but more often unites in one. It is found in xii. 67. 17 ff.: “We have heard that a people without a king (*arājakāḥ prajāḥ*) was perishing, devouring each other like fishes. They therefore came together and made an agreement: to wit, that a voice-hero (brawler), a bully, an adulterer, and a thief should be deserted (made outcast); all the members of all the castes without exception (were to be punished thus). After they had made this agreement, they abode by it, but were, nevertheless, soon overcome by distress; and on this account they came to the grandfather (God), and cried out for a king, (saying) ‘without a king we perish; show us a king whom we may honor, who may protect us.’ He indicated Manu, but Manu did not give them a kind reception, and said, ‘I am afraid of the evil deed; it is hard work to govern men, especially when they are wicked.’ But the people answered, ‘Fear not, the guilt shall rest on the criminals; we will agree to give thee one tenth of our income in grain, and one fiftieth in cattle and gold, a maid to wed (*kanyām culke!*), and escorts to accompany thee, like the gods Indra and Kubera; thou shalt have one fourth of all the religious merit gained by thy people when they are protected by thee.’ Manu thereupon accepted the kingdom, and ruled, destroying enemies and confining the people to their proper occupations. Therefore men who want increase should put a king at their head,” etc. It is to be observed of this tale that the offer made to Manu by the democratic people was not munificent from a financial point of view, but very liberal as respects the religious gain; and Manu might have told them that, according to his own law-book (vii. 130), he had a right to claim a tax of one sixth on grain, or one eighth, or one twelfth; but that one tenth was not the amount designated by his law; he might too have said that he was entitled to only one sixth of their religious merit (according to M. viii. 305), and could not avoid receiving a share of demerit when sinners did wrong through his kingly negligence! (One sixth is antique: cf. Vas. i. 44.)

5. Before giving the quotations from Manu as law-giver, I group here three or four allusions to him as a mystic being. In i. 170. 43, he imparts to Soma the science of seeing (*cākṣuṣī vidyā*). In xiii. 46. 89, he runs away to heaven; and amid some

verses on women, like those in M. v. 55 ff. (none of them being here assigned to Manu), we read: “(When) Manu (was) desirous of going to heaven, he bestowed women upon men: (women who are) weak, jealous, etc.” The verb is used of giving in marriage; possibly the “anxious to go to heaven” (*jigamisur divam*) explains the cause of the action. A conversation of very modern tone is spoken of in xiii. 98. 64, between Bali and Çukra, and told by Manu, son of the Self-existent, to Suvarna, and by him to Nārada. Such conversations make of Manu a mere *deus ex machina*. Another conversation will be found in xii. 201–206, in regard to metaphysical and physical subjects; the speakers being the “best of creatures” (*cresthah prajānām*: i. e., Manu Prajāpati) and the great seer Brhaspati. Occasionally, in such passages, a line reminds us of the Manavan-text (as 204. 4, *yena yena carirena yad yat karma karoty ayam* etc.).

In i. 52, “Manu” has been explained as equal to *Mantra* (as, e. g., in Hārīta, Dh. Çās. Sang.), though it is not clear if this be the case (*Manvādi-Bhāratam kecid . . . adhīyate*).

Many of the quotations given above have, aside from their own character, the stamp of late origin upon them. Most of them are from the latest portion of the epic, and not a few from that book which no one can read in conjunction with the rest without being impressed by its distinctively modern tone, aside from the fact that it seems historically to be later than the time when the work was transported to Bali. Now in the quotations I give below, it is interesting to find that a similar ratio of old and new exists, according as the citations are found in the earlier or later books. What follows are the direct utterances of Manu as quoted in the Mahābhārata. I subjoin these in groups: as they are found in the earlier books, in the twelfth book, and in the remainder of the work. The twelfth book, from its especial attention to *dharmaçāstra*, deserves a particular division, being also earlier than the thirteenth, but not so early as the preceding books. Another division groups these quotations according as they are or are not found in our present Manu-treatise.

A. FROM THE EARLY BOOKS: QUOTATIONS NOT FOUND IN OUR PRESENT MĀNAVA-TREATISE.

1. *Daçagrotriyasamo rājā, ity evam Manur abravit* (i. 41. 31), ‘Manu said, a king is equal to ten (Brahmans) learned in revelation.’ No such statement is made in our text, while the comparison actually extant (‘the teacher is equal to ten learned in revelation’) will be found in Mbhā. xii. 108: 16, although not attributed to Manu.

2. In v. 37. 1 ff., “Manu Svāyambhuva said that these seventeen men smite with their fists at air, and those divinities who carry fetters in their hands lead these men to hell: (the seventeen are)

1. one instructing another who ought not to be instructed ; 2. he who satisfies, or 3. pleases an enemy ; 4. one who protecting women seeks enjoyment ; 5. one who asks what ought not to be asked ; 6. one who says what ought not to be said ; 7. one high-born who does what ought not to be done ; 8. one who, being weak, hates strongly ; 9. one who speaks to an unbeliever ; 10. one who loves what ought not to be loved ; 11. one who, being a father-in-law, fools with (his son's) wife, or 12. desires honor from her ; 13. one who commits adultery ; 14. one who reviles women ; 15. one who takes without thanks ; 16. one who gives and tells of it ; 17. one who initiates the bad to a (*sattrā*) religious ceremony.

We find nowhere in our text such a specific list, although some of these sinners are mentioned and condemned in a general way ; but there is nothing apparently to warrant the words *saptadace* 'mān *Manu* *abравit*.

3. In iii. 35. 21 : "Hast thou heard the royal laws, as Manu declared them—cruel, deceitful," etc. (*acrausis tvāṁ rājadharmān yathā vai Manur abравit*: *krūrān nikrtisampannān vihitān ayaṁtāmakān*). No objection could perhaps be taken to this passage, put in the mouth of Bhīma, were it not for the word "deceitful;" but in the very rules quoted, the practice of deceit is forbidden, and all such practices as those Bhīma is urging are especially condemned (as they are elsewhere in the epic : cf. ib. 52. 22, and 12. 7, "he who acts deceitfully goes to hell"). The act urged is not one where deceitful ministers are employed, but is directed against a fair enemy (cf. 20, *ghṛṇī brāhmaṇarūpo si* ; "but in the Kṣatriya caste cruel-minded men are born").

4. In v. 40. 10 and 11: *ajoksā* (Comm., *ajena sahitā uksāḥ*) *candanām vīnā ādarco madhusarpīśi*: *visam audumbarām cañ-khāḥ svārṇānābho 'tha rocanā*: *grhe sthāpayitavyāni dhanyāni Manur abравit*: *devabrahmanapūjārtham atithinām ca . . .* That is, a formal list of things which Manu declared should be placed in every house, for the sake of honoring the gods, Brahmans, and guests. Compare in contrast to this the simple command (for no such list exists in our text) of the Mānava-treatise, that grass, earth, water, and kind words should not be wanting (M. iii. 101).

5. In i. 73. 8 ff., the eight traditional marriages legally allowed (*dharmataḥ smṛtāḥ*) are given (as in M. iii. 21) ; and then occur these words: *teśām dharmān yathāpūrvam Manu svāyambhuvo 'bravit* ("Manu said that the merit obtained by these was in accordance with the position of each in the list"). This cannot be inferred from the order given in our Mānava-text, where we find (iii. 38) the *ārsa* form represented as being only one-half as beneficial as the *prājāpatya* ; yet the Manu-treatise (ib. 36) also ascribes this order to Manu ! The quotation says further: "the four first are approved for a Brahman, six in order are for a Kṣatriya ;" now the Manu-treatise says (employing in iii. 24 ff. the same word *prācasta*, 'approved') "the singers know four are for a Brahman ;" but in verse 23 the *sādānūpūrvyāḥ* ('six first in order') are for a Brahman, and the four last are for a Kṣatriya ; and, moreover,

the law-treatise says explicitly that four of these only bring good fruit, whereas the epic would permit the *gāndharva* form as “that best for a Kṣatriya” (27); so that it would seem scarcely possible to suppose that we here have any allusion to such a “Manu” as we now possess, although the last remark is made by Çakuntalā’s father from interested motives. Furthermore, in verse 19, the king contracts a *gāndharva* marriage by “taking her hands according to rule and living with her,” though the Mānava-treatise (*loc. cit.*, verse 43) says that this ceremony of joining hands is to be performed only when the two are of the same caste, while these here concerned are respectively of Kṣatriya and Brahman caste. It is further interesting that the verses placed between those quoted above, although agreeing with our Manu-text, are designated as “remembered” only. Now, although the Mānava-text is a little uncertain in regard to the “best” marriage for each caste, so that the implied quotation may have once been in conformity with a Mānava-treatise, there is no question as to the one decisive and formal quotation; it is not in our text, and is contradicted by it. In spite of the fact that the passage occurs in a story, it is improbable that, had the Manu-treatise existed as we now have it at that time, such a quotation could have been made from it. In a later passage (xiii. 44. 9 ff.) the account is more like the law-book.

6. In i. 74. 99, we find a passage on sons (which may be compared in general with M. ix. 158 ff.), which reads as follows: *svapatiṇiprabhavān pañca labdhān kṛtān vivardhitān*: *kṛtān anyāsu co 'tpannān putrān vai Manur abravit*; although in i. 120. 32 ff. there are twelve sons given, agreeing in the main with the list of twelve in the Mānava-treatise, and preceded by *ime vai bandhudāyādāh sat putrā dharmadarcane*: *sad evā 'bandhudāyādāh putrāh*. But if this Dharmadarcana be the Mānava-treatise, it is an incorrect quotation; and moreover, some of the sons are not the same as those in the Mānava-treatise; there is besides a change in the order. The most interesting part of this quotation is that Manu claims this arrangement of sons as his own, while in Baudhāyana (ii. 2. 3. 33) the son- and heir-ship is especially restricted to the legitimate son, by a quotation from Aupajandhani.

B. FROM THE EARLY BOOKS: QUOTATIONS FOUND IN OUR PRESENT MĀNAVA-TREATISE.

In verse 36 of the last extract (i. 120), there is a verse ascribed in one set of words to Manu (*apatyām creśham ātmaçukrād api Manuḥ svāyambhuvo 'bravīt*), which, although not just so expressed, is found in sense in the Mānava-treatise (cf. M. ix. 166); so that we may include this, as correct in thought, under B.

1. i. 120. 36: like in thought (though not an exact quotation) to M. ix. 166.

2. In iii. 180. 35: (“The life of a Brahman proves he is a Brahman; but”) *tāvac chūdrasamo hy esa yāvad vede na jāyate*: *tasminn evam matidvaidhe Manuḥ svāyambhuvo 'bravīt*: M. ii. 172.

It is odd that we should find but two quotations in all these early books capable of being verified in our present Mānava-text. In iii. 32. 39 we have one quotation which has no special significance, one way or the other: *kartavyam eva karne 'ti Manor esa viñiccayaḥ*. The words occur in a philosophic section, where the doctrine of *karma* (meaning here energetic action) is urged, as opposed to passively receiving what fate may bring (and the moral is drawn [b] *ekāntena hy anīhō 'yam parābhavati pūruṣah*). M. ix. 300 (omitted by Medhātithi) is something like it.

C. FROM THE TWELFTH BOOK: QUOTATIONS NOT FOUND IN OUR PRESENT MĀNAVA-TREATISE.

1 and 2. In xii. 57. 43: The *rāja-dharma* of Manu noticed above are introduced again: *prācetasena Manunā glokau ee 'māv udāhṛtau rājadharmesu*. These two verses (this is the first time we find a definite verse-quotation) are verses 44 and 45 (compare *Indische Sprüche* 6608, given here and in Book V.), and neither of them is to be found in our Mānava-text:

44. *ṣad etān puruṣo jahyād bhinnām nāvam ivā 'rṇave :*
apravaktāram ācāryam anadhiyānam ṛtvijam.
 45. *arakṣitāram rājānam bhāryām cā 'priyavādinīm :*
grāmakāmām ca gopālam vanakāmām ca nāpitam.

The only place where the barber (*nāpita*) is mentioned in our Mānava-text is at iv. 253, where permission is given to the Brahman to eat his food; and there is nothing that resembles "these two verses declared by Manu in his rules for kings."

3. In xii. 112. 17 . . . *budhimūlam tu vijayam Manur abravīt*; and, again, in verse 19 (said of the four kinds of acts, those of intelligence, arm, foot, and bearing burdens): *rājyaṁ tiṣṭhati dakṣasya saṁgrhite 'ndriyasya ca: ārtasya budhimūlam hi vijayam Manur abravīt*. Our text contains no such pithy remark as this.

4. In xii. 139. 103: The "seven qualities of a king," as here explained, are unknown to our present Mānava-treatise, although the verse says that Manu proclaimed them: *mātā pitā gurur goptā vahnīr Vaiśravāṇo Yamah: sapta rājño gunān etān Manur āha prajāpāth*. These are explained in the following verses: the king is like a father when he is compassionate; a mother, when he nourishes the wretched; fire, when he consumes his enemies; Yama, when he restrains the wicked (*yamayann asato Yamah*); Kubera, when he offers sacrifice; a Guru, when he gives instruction; a protector, when he protects (his people). The passages in M. vii. 4, ix. 303-311 will be at once recalled; but if we examine the two lists, it will be found that the epic category as compared with the legal one is both redundant and defective, while in the Mānava-treatise the king is nowhere compared to a mother or to a Guru (in this way, *gurūṇ yathā* of the king in vii. 175 is another thing); still less is there such a group as this given.

5. In xii. 121. 8-12: Manu appears as the spokesman of

Brahmá, in the personification of punishment; he is the very *danda* (punishment), in whom all has its support; *vyavahāra* is established as a reckoning in *dharma* (*dharmaśamkhyā* *vyavahāra iti 'syate*); and then follows: *ity evam vyavahārasya vyavahāravam isyate: api cai 'tat purā rājan Manunā proktam āditah* (10). *suprānūtenū dandena priyāpriyāsamātmānā: prajā raksate yah samyag dharma eva sa kevalah* (11). *yatho 'ktam etad vacanam prāg eva Manunā purā: yan mayo 'ktam* *Brahmano vacanam mahat* (12). *prāg idam vacanam proktam atah prāgvacanām viduh: vyavahārasya cā "khyānād vyavahāra iho 'cyate* (13). (Comm.: "Verse 11, uttered by Manu, is thus the utterance of Brahmá, heard from the mouth of Manu.")

It needs scarcely to be said that neither the definition of *vyavahāra* nor the verbatim quotation (verse 11: 'He is the very *dharma* who protects the people with well-directed punishment, he of whom the essence is indifference to pleasant or unpleasant things') is found in our text of the Mānava-treatise.

6. In xii. 152. 14 (this remark is not found in our present Mānava-text, although the nearest approach to it is found in M. v. 108 and vi. 96, where one is said to obtain heaven after "removing sin by giving up the world"): *tyāgadharmaḥ pavitrāṇām sannyāsam Manur abravīt* (Comm.: "Among all the five means of purification, the meritorious act of giving is very important, but giving up the world is most important; so Manu said it was even more important than that"). The *tyāga* here is really gifts: cf. M. xi. 6, but note that even this verse is not in Medhātithi.

(7. See below, D. 2, one verse ascribed to Manu, and not in our text.)

D. FROM THE TWELFTH BOOK: QUOTATIONS FOUND IN OUR PRESENT MĀNAVA-TREATISE.

1. xii. 55. 19: Bhīṣma begins his long discourse by referring to Manu Svāyambhuva, to support the idea that the king who strews the earth with blood, killing even the Guru in battle, does well; for, *āhutena rane nityam yoddhavyam kṣatrabandhūnā: dharmaṇam svargyam lokyam ca yudham hi Manur abravīt*. The general thought is identical with M. vii. 88-89, so that I place it among the extant quotations, although the Mānava-treatise we possess never applies the adjective *lokyā* to any thing, and never says that battle is *svargya* ('conducive to heaven'), while in the Mānava-text this adjective is curiously enough applied with a negative to *prāṇivadha* ("the destruction of animate creatures is not conducive to heaven")—where, however, slaughter of animals is intended (M. v. 48).

2. The following quotations are (from the standpoint of our present Mānava-text) half-wrong and half-right; xii. 56. 23 introduces them thus:

Manunā cai 'va . . . gītāu clokāu mahātmanā dharmesu svesu ('these two verses are sung by magnanimous Manu in his laws'). The first is then given, verse 24= M. ix. 321 (repeated in v. 15. 34

as an original remark by Agni); the second is not found in our present Mānava-text:

(25) *ayo hanti yadā 'gmānam agnīnā vāri hanyate: brahma ca kṣatriyo dvesti tadā sidanti te trayah* (repeated with v. l., and not as a quotation, in xii. 78. 22-23).

Two verses follow close on these, declared to be "from Uçanas." One of them is the saying found in Manu viii. 351 (*manyus tam manyum recchati* etc.); the other inculcates the Manavan doctrine that even a Brahman learned in revelation may be slain in battle. It means a great deal, when we thus find one verse attributed to Manu which is not in our text, and immediately following one in our text referred to "Uçanas." In 34. 19, the latter is "from the Veda."

3. Of xii. 78. 31, the general sense only is found in our present text: "Manu said that those who subdue the haters of Brahmans go to heaven, etc., purified as by bathing in a sacrificial stream." What is meant is that even Brahmans may fight in battle to subdue their enemies, and that those who do so go to heaven (*brahmaviso niyacchantaḥ . . . brahmalokajitāḥ svargyān vīrān tān Manur abravīt*).

4. If the "son of the Self-existent" is always Manu, the following general quotation (xii. 95. 14) may be classed with the above as correct in sentiment: *dharmena yoddhavyam*, for "so said the son of the Self-existent:" a short rule inculcating honorable fighting, which follows after detailed advice of the same sort, like the *satām dharmah* of M. vii. 90-93.

5. As to the efficacy of the *aghāmarsāṇa*, we have a quotation (xii. 152. 30) which is like the present text: *api cā 'psu nimaj-jeta jāpāṇi trir aghāmarsanam: yathā 'cvamedhāvabhr̥thas tathā tan Manur abravīt*. If we compare this with M. xi. 260-261, and again with xi. 83, we may possibly accept it as a combination of two statements: one, that a man is released from all sin by repeating the *aghāmarsāṇa* and taking the bath, because this text releases from all sin just as a horse-sacrifice does; and the other, that even a Brahman-slayer is purified by a bath at a horse-sacrifice. Baudh. iv. 2. 15 ascribes a like remark to Manu: cf. Gaut. xxiv. 10.

6. The same Manu as that in C. 1 and 2 is credited, along with others, with praising "protection"—a remark so general that it might be applied to any Hindu law-book; but I insert it here as "verified," not wishing to strain my argument by excluding doubtful evidence. It will be noticed that we here have the *rājā-çāstram* of Manu spoken of, and that Manu is not the foremost authority. Thus, xii. 58. 1 ff.: "The essence of the king's duty is to protect, for the Lord Brhaspati praises it, (as do also) Viçālākṣa, Kāvya, Mahendra, Prācetasā Manu, Bharadvāja, and Gaurāçiras—all these deducers of *rājā-çāstra* praise protection (*rājā-çāstrapranetāro brahmāṇyā brahmavādinah: rakṣām eva praçānsanti dharmam*).

7. A general quotation, the first words of which are the same

as M. iv. 2, and the spirit of which agrees with the Mānava-treatise throughout, is xii. 21. 11 and 12: *adrohenai 'va bhūtā-nām yo dharmah sa satām mataḥ: adrohah satyāvacanām sām-vibhāgo dayā dāmāḥ. prajanām sveṣu dāreṣu mārdavaṁ hrīr acāpalam: evaṁ dharmam pradhānestam Manuḥ svāyambhuvo 'bravīt.*

8. The next quotation I doubtfully place in this division. Bhīṣma says that all those who by their evil deeds do injury to their fellows should be officially taken in hand and restrained, adding (xii. 88. 16) "this ordinance was made of old by Manu" (*na kenacid yācitavyah kaṣcit kiṁcid anāpadi: iti vyavasthā bhūtānām purastān Manunā kṛtā*). The Calcutta edition (=3317) has *kasyāṁcid āpadi*; and I see no resemblance to any passage we have in our present text, especially as the commentator speaks of *kiṁcid* as *dattam rṇām kāraṇ vā*; but as Manu says a Brahman should not ask alms of bad men, it may pass as a half-supported quotation from our text, though it seems here to refer to the king's levying a tax. It is in form more like that spurious verse found in one of the Paris MSS. of Kullūka, after iii. 259 in our Mānava-treatise, and evidently stolen from Viṣṇu lxxiii. 30 (*mā ca yāciṣma kāmcanā* etc.).

I have already referred to the fact that the Self-existent is sometimes the enunciator of laws which seem (by the wording of the same being like Manu-verses) to imply his "son," as in xii. 121. 12 (see above), where Manu is formally spoken of as the spokesman of Brahmā, a sort of popular mouthpiece for the commands of the Divine Being. Such remarks, however, as that in xii. 167. 46, where the Blessed Self-existent declares that no release is obtainable except by perfect disunion with birth, age, etc., or "the rule as created by the Self-existent" (viz. that warriors are cruel), v. 132. 7, cannot be taken as implying a quotation from Manu, since there are various interpreters beside Manu of the divine sayings. For this reason I make no attempt to group the "laws of the Self-existent" with those "declared by Manu;" though I cannot refrain from remarking that no universality attained by the Manavan law-treatise ever results in the Mahābhārata's condemning to hell those who despise it. If a sacred and universal law-authority is sought, we must go back of Manu, to his "father"—in other words, the epic appeals not to Manu, but, as the Mānava-treatise itself does, to the Self-existent only, when it would give the weight of the highest authority to its words: "Those who break the ordinances of the Self-existent sink into hell" (xii. 321. 30 ff.); but never is this said of those who break the ordinances of Manu. Yet the Self-existent is at times made responsible for a verse so very like that of his son's treatise, that we are tempted to believe the quoter quoted from the latter, intending to imply that he was spokesman. One such case will answer: xii. 59. 60: "There are said to be ten vices produced by anger and lust, and the teachers say that (four vices) declared by the Self-existent are produced by lust." Com-

pare with this M. vii. 47 and 50. These four are the worst of ten vices produced by lust, and there are eight produced by anger, with three of them regarded as "worst," making a new group of seven worst vices (cf. *Mbhā*. ii. 68. 20; xii. 140. 26: the epic admits the *yuktyā* doctrine, like the later *Nītisāra*, i. 49). If this grouping of vices is meant as a quotation from Manu, it is incorrect, according to our text to-day.

In all these quotations from the earlier and from the twelfth book, we have heard nothing of Manu's *Dharmaçāstra*; when his laws are mentioned, they are spoken of as the laws (*dharmaḥ*) alone, or the Royal-treatise (*rāja-çāstra*) of Manu. In the thirteenth book we find the *Dharmaçāstra* for the first time.

E. FROM THE THIRTEENTH BOOK: QUOTATIONS NOT FOUND IN OUR PRESENT MĀNAVA-TREATISE.

The first quotation shows again the same odd fact: that, amid many verses which are not attributed to Manu, but are actually found in our Mānava-treatise, there is one attributed to him but not found in our text.

1. xiii. 88. 3 = M. iii. 267; ib. 5 = M. ib. 268, and so on for several verses; while, between these, verse 4 in the epic passage, although not in our present Mānava-text at all, is given as a quotation from Manu: *vardhamānatilam ḡrāddham akṣayam Manur abravīt* (and therefore *tila* is mentioned before all edibles). A little further on (11): "Songs sung by manes are sung, which the Blessed Sanatkumāra told me (*Bhīṣma*)"; and this song proves to be compounded of M. iii. 273-4-5.*

2. In praise of the holy pools (*tīrtha*), we are told (xiii. 65. 3) that Manu said: "the highest gift of gifts is something to drink, and therefore one should dig pools, ponds, etc." This is not in our Mānava-text, which has no praise for the later *tīrtha*; on the contrary, a gift of water is not spoken of with much admiration (compare M. iii. 202, "even a gift of water fits one for immor-

* In connection with these rules for *Crāddha*, it is interesting to note that no notion of their origin being due to Manu is found in the *Mahābhārata*, although that idea is expressed in the law-Sūtras. On the contrary, in xiii. 91, we find the *Crāddha* ceremony ascribed to Nimi. Yudhishthira asks (1 ff.) by whom the *Crāddha* was ordained, and at what time, and of what sort it was: was it, he asks, discovered in the time of Bhṛgu and Angiras (*Bhṛgaṅgirasike kāle*), or by what devotee? Bhīṣma responds: Atri, son of the Self-existent, had a descendant Dattātreya; he had a son Nimi, who became awakened (*pratibuddha*) after losing his son. He thought out the *Crāddhakalpa*, and what fruits and roots befit it; then he bade priests, and gave them gifts on the first day of the moon. But he afterward reflected: 'Why have I done this thing, never done by sages of old?' Then Atri came and comforted him, telling him that this sacrifice to the manes was a law of old, seen (invented) by Brahma himself, and that it was agreeable to the Self-existent, etc. As Atri is called the son of the Self-existent, it is plain that this epithet does not designate Manu in all cases; but that it generally does, when used alone, I think is without doubt. To whom, however, does this refer, in xii. 293. 11: "A Vaiçya should make gain, honoring the only son of the creator (Dhātar) who was born of the Self-existent (*svayambhūr . . . asrijat . . . dhātūram . . . dhātā 'srjat putram ekam, tum arcayitvā vaiçyah, etc.*)"?

tality," but only because it is rendered sacred by the *grāddha*; while "water-giver" comes at the beginning of a list of those whose gifts are mentioned in ascending value; and, ib. 267, water is a subordinate gift). Should any great stress be laid on the fact that Manu occasionally comes first in a list of law-givers, it would be well to note that in this passage he is preceded by Atri (*pitā-mahasūta*) and Hariçandra (*manujendra*), with their several verses on desirable gifts (cf. below, xiii. 115. 12).

3. In xiii. 61. 34 is discussed a rather abstruse point in regard to the proportion of religious merit or demerit obtained by a king as a result of protecting or neglecting his people. After stigmatizing the king who does not protect his people as a *rājakali*, the speaker says (35): "The king incurs one fourth of all the sin committed by his people when they are not protected; now some say the whole (sin) comes upon the king, (or) moreover, a half. This is their decision; but our opinion is that (the sin incurred by the king) is one fourth (of the whole), having heard the ordinance of Manu" (*caturtham matam asmākam Manoh grutvā 'nuçāsanam*). Cf. above in the tale of Manu as king (xi. 67. 17 ff.), and xii. 75. 6, 7; 88. 18-20, here given as *gruti*. Our present text awards this proportion of the sin only in case of incorrect decisions at court, where there are more than two parties to divide the sin among (M. viii. 18): but in the case at hand it emphatically says that the proportion is one sixth, or all, if the tax taken by the king (to insure protection) amounts to one sixth (viii. 304-308); while Yājñavalkya's law-treatise sets it at one half. The good obtained by a king who protects well is in the same proportion: according to our Mānava-text being one sixth, according to the Manu of the Mahābhārata being one fourth.

F. FROM THE THIRTEENTH BOOK: QUOTATIONS FOUND IN OUR PRESENT MĀNAVA-TREATISE.

1. xiii. 47. 35 *et circa*: There is a great difference in what one calls a Brahman's "wives;" the wife of the Brahman caste is best and highest; she alone waits upon him, etc. "Even in the treatise laid down by Manu this is perceived to be the eternal rule of right" (*Manunā 'bhihitam gāstram yac cā 'pi . . . tatrā 'py esa . . . drsto dharmah sanātanaḥ*). Compare with this M. ix. 85. Another quotation in this same chapter, agreeing with the laws of our Mānava-treatise, is attributed not to Manu, but to the Self-existent (ib. 58): "The eldest has the best share, the pick of the property; this is the rule of partition formerly declared by the Self-existent (*dāyavidhī pūrvam uktah svayambhuvā*)."

2 and 3. xiii. 44: Contains two quotations strictly Manavan. In verse 18: "A man should marry a girl who is not a Sapinda on the mother's or of the same family on the father's side (*asapindā mātūr asagotrā pituh*). Manu declared this law (*tām dharmam Manur abravīt*)."
Compare M. iii. 5. In verse 23: "Manu does not approve of cohabitation with one who has no desire" (*na hy akāmena samvāsam Manur evam praçānsati*).

4. xiii. 115. 10 ff.: A curious passage in regard to the eating of

meat, which begins with the statement that the seers had discussed the subject very thoroughly, and had all agreed that (10) if one firm in his vows should sacrifice month by month with a horse-sacrifice, or, again, should abstain from eating honey and meat, the reward in each case would be equal (a slight variation of verse 16, below); then follow the opinions of some of the ancients:

Verse 12: *na bhakṣayati yo mānsam na ca hanyān na ghātayet: tam mitram sarvabhūtānām Manuh svāyambhuvo 'bravīt.* Compare M. v. 50, where the first clause only is given, with the result *sa loke priyatām yāti*, etc.

Verse 14 gives M. v. 52 *a* verbatim, and in *b* ascribes the words to Nārada (*Nāradah prāha dharmātmā niyatām so 'vasidati*).

Verse 15: Brhaspati declares that by abstaining (*nivṛttyā*) from honey and meat one in effect makes gifts, sacrifices, becomes devout. Compare M. vi. 14. In M. v. 56 it is said that abstinence in eating meat and drinking intoxicating liquors brings great reward, although no fault exists in the practice. The same antithesis of *pravṛtti* and *nivṛtti* is found Mbhā. xiii. 115. 85.

Verse 16 is in *a* the same as M. v. 53 *a*, except *māsi māsi* for *varṣe varṣe*; in *b* it is declared to be the speaker's opinion (*na khādati ca yo mānsam samam etan matam mama*). Bhiṣma assumes the responsibility for this statement, though the remark is above, verse 10, accredited to the sages in general.

In 116. 11 *a*, we find 115. 14 *a* repeated, but not ascribed to Nārada; *b* adds that such a sinner is a very mean and harmful man, as does Manu.

5. In xiii. 115. 53 we are told, after a description of the meat proper for a pure sacrifice, that Manu declared other kinds sinful (*ato 'nyathā vrthāmānsam abhakṣyam Manur abravīt: asvargyam ayacasyam ca raksovat . . .* (similarly in 116. 15, we find *rākṣaso vidhiḥ*, but only *ucyate*, 'it is said').

The sentiment of the first portion of this our Mānava-text also assigns to Manu, in saying that cattle may be slaughtered, but only at a sacrifice, and on no other occasion, "said Manu" (M. v. 41); the comparison of the second part is given in M. v. 50 (*piçācavat*), and previously in v. 31. On this same point I notice that the words of M. v. 39 are in Mbhā. xiii. 116. 14, given as a *gruti*.

The general result of this passage for our inquiry is this: that the whole accords with our present text in the Mānava-treatise, inasmuch as the latter permits meat-eating only at a sacrifice. But, in particular, one fourth only of the verse here ascribed to Manu is found in our present Mānava-text; while half a verse extant there is here ascribed to Nārada, another half-verse (except for a small *v. l.*) is claimed as the speaker's opinion, and a general sentiment in the same connection like one found in the Mānava-text is quoted from Brhaspati. Another curious thing is that in the *rākṣaso vidhiḥ* quotation (cf. M. v. 31), where the words are almost identical with those in our Mānava-text, it is not noted as a quotation from it; but where the words vary,

introducing a new element not in the corresponding verse of our present Mānava-text, then it is assigned to Manu!

6. Although Dakṣa is called Prācetasa, I think it is probably to Manu that this epithet refers in xiii. 46. 1 (we have had already the same epithet twice applied to Manu): "The sages of old repeat the word of Prācetasa (which is), 'it is not a sale if the relatives of a woman do not receive anything; for (2) it is an honor shown to the girl'" (like M. iii. 54). The commentator refers the authority to Dakṣa. The meaning is, that valuables given by the bridegroom at a marriage, if the relatives of the bride do not take them, are not to be regarded as constituting a sale of the girl; they are a token of respect to the girl herself.

7. A doubtful quotation occurs xiii. 68. 31: "Manu, the knower of *dharma*, has declared (*prāha*) that the spiritual merit (*dharma*) is endless (*akṣaya*), both of the man who gives a present when abiding firmly in the right, and of him (who is of similar sort) to whom (the former) gives (the present)." The gist of this is in M. iv. 235, although no such quotation is actually extant in our text; and the Manu-treatise says about the same regarding presents from a king in vii. 86 (cf. 82, 83, *akṣayo nidhiḥ*), although only half the idea is here expressed. We may perhaps assume that it is a quotation made from the general idea, and based on what we find in our present text.

The statistical result obtained by grouping these quotations is as follows:

Quotations found in Mbhā., books	Verified (in our Mānava-text).	Unverified.
i.-xi.	2	6
xii.	8	7
xiii.	7	3
	<u>17</u>	<u>16</u>

Those "unverified" are not to be found in our present Mānava-treatise, either in word or thought. Those "verified" are of two sorts: *a*, where the words quoted correspond to the words found in our text; *b*, where the sentiment only can be verified in our text. It may sometimes be open to question whether a quotation I mark as verified in sentiment (*b*) is not really meant to be a direct quotation in words, and therefore strictly unverified. As this is impossible to settle, I have in each case given the benefit of the doubt, which I think is also more in harmony with the Hindu method of making quotations. Such a subdivision of the verified quotations gives us: i.-xi., *a.* 1, *b.* 1; xii., *a.* 2, *b.* 6; xiii., *a.* 2, *b.* 5. The quotation from iii. 32. 39 I have not reckoned in either group. If we discriminate between precise verbal quotations and general ones of the thought only, we shall have:

Verified verbal quotations	5
Verified general quotations	13
Unverified quotations	16
Not counted	<u>1</u>
	<u>35</u>

There is, however, a great difference in the correctness of the quotations from the early books (speaking of course always from the standard of our Mānava-text). The twelfth book, with its numerous chapters on law, forms as it were a bridge between the other two sets. But take books i.-xi. as a type of the earlier, book xiii. as a type of the later literature. In the former we find six quotations ascribed to Manu, and not found in our present Mānava-text, against two verified by our text; in the latter, only three not found in the present text, against seven verified. The proportion is almost reversed.

An objection may perhaps be presented against this division, to the effect that one has no right to separate the parts of one work so sharply into different classes, there being much that is modern encased in what belongs to the older part of the epic. Though this is true, I think that in general the separation holds good, and quite enough so for the use I have made of it. The quotations from i.-xi. come in general from the earlier portion of the work; no one can doubt the late origin of the thirteenth book, who reads it in connection with the first portions or with book twelve.

The explanation usually accepted for verses such as the unverified quotations I have given above is, that the older recension of the Mānava-treatise differed greatly from the present, was much longer, and contained probably those verses which have since dropped out of the text; so that, as quotations from "Manu," these citations in the Mahābhārata may have been really drawn from an older recension of the Mānava-treatise (Cāstra); or, if not from that, from the still older Dharmasūtra which grew into the Cāstra, passing out of prose into metre, becoming popularized, and resulting in a different work altogether.

This easy and sweeping explanation accounts for everything, and is therefore eagerly accepted. To me it is unsatisfactory. Is it probable that the Dharmācāstram ever was larger than now? I think not. The Hindus say so, but that proves nothing. Their Brhad- was identical with their Vrddha-Manu, and meant no more than "the great," not necessarily implying a *vaco bṛhāttaram*. The law books grow, not dwindle, with the years. Kullūka accredits more verses to Manu than Medhātithi did, and the latter is but a few hundred years earlier than the former. In the more modern Nandini version, still more verses have crept in. Have they not done so always? Again, in the Sūtra, granting that there were verses not preserved in the change to Cāstra, what still shall we say of verses pretending to be from Manu and contradicted in the present Mānava-treatise? Is it probable that these were the rules which lay back of the metrical recension? Did the latter develop into opposition to the Sūtra?

My own view is different, so different that I present it with some hesitation; but it seems to me more reasonable. I have endeavored in this essay to point out the position held respectively by Manu and by the Mānava-treatise. They were quite different.

Manu was an ancient demigod, sage, authority on various matters; his words were decisive. But the treatise of Manu was a work seldom quoted, and that chiefly in the modern portion of the epic. Not more than half the remarks ascribed to Manu are found in the present Mānava-treatise which the Hindus call the Manu-treatise; but, the further on we come toward modern times, the more often the quotations from Manu fit to our present Mānava-text. From these data I draw the conclusion that the Cāstram was in great part collated between the time when the bulk of the epic was composed and its final completion; that, previous to its collation, there had existed a vast number of sententious remarks, proverbial wisdom, rules for morality, etc., which were ascribed, not to this "treatise of Manu" at all, but to the ancient hero Manu as a type of godly wisdom. These I conceive to have floated about in the mouths of the people, not brought together, but all loosely quoted as laws or sayings of Manu; and these sayings were afterwards welded into one with the laws of a particular text called the Mānavas—a union natural enough, as the two bodies of law would then bear the same title, although the sect had no connection with Manu except in name. I fancy this sect built up their *ācāra* ('usages') and *kuladharma* ('family law') out of their own heads, not ascribing them to Manu; then, seizing this distinct mass of "Manu's sayings," they appropriated them, and the two became one; but that most of them were taken in at a much later date than that when their *dharmaśūtra* passed into a metrical *gāstra*. It is thus easy to see why we should find in the Mānava-dharma-gāstra such a number of verses ending with "so said Manu." If Manu says all, why emphasize a few? If all are from the Mānava sect, why insert here and there a Manu-verse? According to my theory, these Manu-verses found in the Mānava-treatise were simply caught up and drawn from the hearsay of the whole Brahman world, keeping their form after incorporation with the Mānavas' text. This was especially valuable, because every time a fraud was intended, they could invent a verse and insert it in the old text. They had so many "Manu saids," that it would be difficult to dispute a new one. Another point is explained by this; for I find that the "Manu said" verses in the Mānava-treatise are often just those which are undoubtedly cases of later and fraudulent additions. Take the two verses in ix. 182, 183 ending in "Manu said"—the oldest commentator does not have them; take the verse on "written agreements," stolen from the later Nārada—it ends with "Manu said." Make a wide application, look at other law-books (for other law-books beside the Mānavas' have caught up or invented these quotations from Manu, and it is unwarranted to assume that the Manu-quotations in the Dharmasūtra of Vasiṣṭha, Gautama, etc. are from the Mānavas' Dharmasūtra, although some may coincide). Doctrines utterly at variance with the Mānava-treatise are palmed off upon us with a "Manu said" doctrines of which we are able to say that they never existed either in the Mānava-

(metrical) treatise or in the (prose) Sūtra. Take for example the Vyavahāra Mayūkha-quotation under the head of division of property (p. 46, ed. Mandlik). The writer, quoting from Nārada on the proper division of acknowledged goods, and stating what should be done when there is a suspicion of goods having been secreted in order to escape division, says: *dryamānā vibhāgyante, kośam gūdhe 'bravī manuh*, 'things visible are divided; Manu said the ordeal by sacred libation (should be applied) in a (case where goods are) concealed.' Now this form of ordeal is not only not in our Mānava-text of to-day, but, the further we go back, the more impossible is it that it ever could have been there; for it represents a time posterior to that described by the Mānava-text, even as we have it now—the time of subsequent law-books, where this kind of ordeal is first described. Of course it could not then have been in the still older Sūtra. In short, it is a modern forgery, endorsed with Manu's name to give it respectability. We find an ever increasing preponderance of quotations more and more doubtful as we come on toward the later literature. That mass of rubbish contained in the Dharmāśtrasaṅgraha, most of which does not deserve the name of Dharmāśtra, has instances enough to prove this.

Such was undoubtedly the Hindu custom. A most interesting case has recently come to my notice, in comparatively modern literature. Among the Notes on Buddhist Law recently published in India are (iii. p. 25: Manvoo-wonana-dhammathat) some chapters on marriage and divorce. Here we find two sections (20-21), the last of which is the only one in all the passages given (pages 1-33) which is referred to Manu, and this not only does not occur in the Mānava-treatise, but is taken directly out of the Buddhist Anganasutta of the Sutta Pitakam; while the many passages plainly from the Mānava-treatise are not ascribed to Manu; and in the corresponding section of the Menu-khyai we often find in the same way sentences not in the Mānava-treatise but attributed to Manu ("from ignorance or design," says the editor). The best example in this series of *dhammathats* is found in the Wagaru-dhammathat, iv. pages 1-5, where, out of thirty-two verses, eleven injunctions are ascribed to Manu, and none of these are found in our Mānava-text; while the passages taken directly from our Mānava-text are not ascribed to any one. Thus, on marriage, verses 4 and 6 are ascribed to Manu, while verse 5 is not; but verse 5 is in our Mānava-text, while verses 4 and 6 are not. Prof. Forchhammer observes, page 3 of his introduction, that Manu is frequently made to endorse the precepts of the Vinaya Pitakam, (by adding) "thus Manu has decided." I do not quote the acts of the Buddhists to prove those of the Brahmans, but I give this as a good example of a custom I believe from other grounds to have been long current among Hindu law-makers. For the earlier law-books I claim, therefore, that a quotation from Manu not verified in the present Mānava-text does not indicate at all that it ever was there. The older the

Sūtra, the more likely that the Manu-quotation is one like those “Manu divided his property among his sons,” “whatever Manu said is curative,” quotations found through the Brāhmaṇa literature, and referring only to the divine or semi-divine being—while at the same time it may happen that a quotation given in one Sūtra from Manu may be found in the Mānava- (metrical) treatise, and have once been in the Mānava- (prose) Sūtra, being current property among the Sūtra-kāras. The kinds of quotations attributed to Manu then in Sūtra, Cāstra, and epic, are of motive and substance; the motive may be to inculcate some new strange doctrine, in which case the quotation is deliberate forgery; or it may be to remind the hearer of some old saying in harmony with what the writer wishes to inculcate, and so calculated to strengthen his assertion—in which case he probably quotes from some of the “sayings of Manu” familiar to the popular ear. The substance of these quotations is either wholly general, proverbial moral teachings etc., or they are special, and bearing on some precise point of law or custom. The last are least in number, till we come to the very modern law-compilations and digests; where, in my opinion, there is more intentionally fraudulent quotation than correct citation, some texts quoting from one authority and others the same from Manu, who is evidently a mere *deus ex machina* in a great many cases; and the quotation from him does not imply that it ever was really taken out of any law-treatise. The Mahābhārata remarks, iii. 313. 110: *pathakāḥ* and *pāthakāḥ* and other *cāstracintakāḥ* are *sarve vyasanino mūrkhāḥ*. In my opinion, the devotees of the legal Cāstra were more knaves than fools.

It is difficult to realize, without examining the matter in detail, what a mere trifle the quotations given in this paper from Manu are, when compared with the vast number of verses corresponding to those in the Mānava-text, but not referred to it or to Manu: most of these latter being given without any authority, some of them being marked as *çruti*, and others attributed to entirely other sources. Another fact must be borne in mind, lest, seeing so much of Manu, we fancy he is *par excellence* the law-maker referred to. He is not. Others share the honor with him. Among these he is sometimes placed in the most conspicuous position, sometimes not. The late inscriptions are prone to place Manu, who at that time was as vague a personage as now, at the head of their lists of law-givers, and, in Hindu parlance, as the primary maker of Dharmācāstra, though it is not the Mānava-laws, but the laws of Manu, they quote; and yet they had their Mānava-dharma-sūtra, and probably by this time their Mānava-dharma-cāstra. In most cases, I think we shall find that “the laws of Manu” are much later than the “Mānava-laws;” though some “sayings of Manu” may go back beyond the time of the Mānavas’

text-book. It seems to me at any rate certain that to refer “Manu said” verses out of the Sūtra and later literature to what may have been lost from the text-book of the Mānava sect is indefensible.

I have touched above upon two points which I wish to elucidate here more fully, by way of supplement to the discussion already given. They are: 1. the quotations from Manu in the late digests of law; 2. the quotations from Manu in the Mānava-treatise itself.

1. I have already spoken of the trial by sacred libation which is accredited to Manu, and shown that it was in reality a later product. It occurs first in Yājñavalkya’s list, and is given in full by Nārada. The Manu-treatise has but three kinds of ordeal; and it is unlikely that a Sūtra would have contained what was only known to later times (see on this point Schlagintweit’s *Gottesurtheile*). I append other improbable quotations from the Vyavahāra-Mayūkha.

On page 77 of Mandlik’s text, we read: “he who receives what ought not to be given and he who gives it shall both be punished like thieves, and be made to pay the highest fine, (said) Manu.” Other texts also refer this to Manu. It is not in our treatise. On pages 50 and 51, we have close together these two verses: “If any common property is discovered after partition, that partition should not be recognized; it should be made again, (said) Manu;” and, “when there is a doubt of partition among co-heirs, the partition must be made again, even if (the heirs) have taken separate abodes, (said) Manu.” Neither of these is in our treatise, though here and elsewhere (Mādhaba etc.), they are attributed to Manu. On page 61, we find a quotation subsequently attributed to Brhaspati given to Manu (Kull. to M. ix. 192). On page 85 (*sa eva* means Manu), Manu is credited with saying, “As they have been enjoyed, reckoning from the time of entry, a house, door, shop, etc., shall be possessed and not removed.” This is not in our treatise; and by other late works it is given to Brhaspati (Vīr., Kām., Mādhaba).

Brhan-Manu is mentioned once in the Vyav. Mayūkha. It is an instructive passage. We find in our treatise, at ix. 142, a verse respecting the relationship of adopted sons to their natural fathers; now a verse with this is quoted in the Dattaka Mīmānsā from Brhan-Manu as a genuine verse, while the Vyav. Mayūkha quotes it only to say of it “we know of no foundation for this quotation” (*tasya mūlam na vidmāh*: page 45). In the Mitākṣarā (ii. 5. 6), we find another difference with our Mānava-text (v. 60) attributed to Brhan-Manu. Shall we say that this is an old verse lost in our text, or also that “we know of no foundation for it?” Two quotations occur in the Vyav. May. from Vṛddha-Manu (so in Vīramitrodaya); both are simple additions to our text, on the subject of the responsibility of servants, and the obligation to pay them “half wages” if they are engaged and dis-

missed before the expiration of the time of the agreement. *Vira-mitrodaya* gives them to Br̥han-Manu.

That Br̥han-Manu and Vr̥ddha-Manu are one is proved by the fact that e. g. the *Dāya-bhāga*, xi. 1. 7 (Stokes, page 305), attributes to Br̥han-Manu a verse on the behavior of the widow of a childless man (wherein she is the sole inheritor), which in the *Mitāksarā* is given to Vr̥ddha-Manu (ii. 1. 6).

Other texts than the *Mitāksarā* and *Vyavahāra Mayūkha* give late quotations from these two. The *Dāya-bhāga*, ix. 17 (Stokes, page 294), has one which says: "The sons of the Brāhmaṇī shall take the land which was received as a pious gift; but all the sons of the twice-born castes shall take the house, as well as the field which has come down from ancestors." This is opposed to the Mānava-law, and is plainly a late verse, in the interests of Brahmanhood. I do not think it profitable to go with any fullness into these modern texts, but will quote two or three to show their uniformly late appearance. *Dāya-bhāga*, ii. 23 (Stokes, page 204): "The support of persons to be maintained is the approved means of gaining heaven; but hell is a man's portion if they suffer; therefore let one carefully maintain them.—Manu." This is carried over from the relation of king to priest. *Dattaka-mīmānsā*, i. 9 (Stokes, page 533), quotes from Manu, "a son of any description must be anxiously adopted, for the sake of the funeral cake etc." This is opposed; for our treatise limits in kind the adopted son. It is also ascribed to Manu in another late treatise, the *Dattaka-Candrikā*. These two texts both ascribe the following to Manu (D. M. v. 45; D. C. vi. 3; Stokes, pages 595-662): "He who adopts a son without observing the rules ordained should make him a participator of the rites of marriage, but not a sharer of the wealth." This is also not Manavan in its sentiment. Let us also remember that the earliest law knew nothing of adopting sons (*Sūtra of Gautama*) with such distinctions; therefore it cannot be antique.

"Joint property cannot be given," is a quotation given to Manu by the commentators to *Dāya-bhāga*; most authorities ascribe it to Br̥haspati (D. B. ii. 27; Stokes, page 206). So a passage of Br̥haspati according to *Dāya-bhāga* ii. 43 (Stokes, page 212) is really in M. ix. 156.

From these random quotations the theory I have advanced seems strengthened. Manu-quotations are mostly very modern in tone, and do not prove old verses lost from our text. As to Br̥hat or Vr̥ddha-Manu, I think he was an invention, and probably as worthless an addition to legal literature as the many other Br̥hats and Vr̥ddhas which have been preserved to show how late and spurious such works on the face of them are. Vr̥ddha does not mean 'old,' but 'bulky,' I think.

2. Unverified quotations from Manu in the Mānava-dharma-śāstra. By this (to a Hindu) somewhat paradoxical title I mean those verses in our present Mānava-treatise which are quoted as coming from Manu by the usual stamp at the end, a "Manu said

so," or a "this is the ordinance of Manu." Prajāpati, though usually interpreted as equivalent to Manu, I do not include here, or in other quotations. This is the last point of view from which I shall attempt to investigate these quotations, for I have gone carefully through all those contained in the later Smṛtis of the Dharmācāstrasāṅgraha published in Calcutta, and do not think them worth alluding to, although they support my position. Even the few verses of Nārada quoting Manu I omit, though here too the searcher will find ground for my argument. The Mānava-treatise is clearly the most difficult portion of the investigation, as the whole treatise in which the Manu-verses are found is attributed by the Hindus to Manu. I do not want to strain the argument, and I admit frankly that there are verses stamped in this manner which I cannot prove to be modern additions to the whole work. It is sufficient for my purpose, however, to show what I am convinced is the case—that since the Mānava-treatise was completed, spurious verses have crept in; and that, in most of the cases where we find verses ending with "Manu said," there are signs of their being later additions when they are found in the late portions of the work, signs given by text-criticism, and entirely apart from the fact that they bear this formula. According to the theory I have advanced, such verses ought to be found most frequently in the portion of the work latest developed and most enlarged. Now, not giving credence to Dr. Burnell's theory that the treatise was composed for a king as a guide to his administration (a theory which, as he has baldly stated it, seems to me at variance with the historical development), and accepting the generally received opinion that the Mānava law-book is a normal growth out of the Mānava (prose) Sūtra, it will be probable at the outset that the chapters on civil and criminal law will contain most of these unverified, i. e. surreptitiously inserted, verses, since these chapters (viii. and ix.) have probably suffered most enlargement since the days of the original Sūtra.

In the Mānava-treatise, after deducting the references to Manu as maker of the treatise (i. 1, 102, 118, 119; xii. 117; inferred, i. 4, 33, 34, 58, 60, 61, 79; as in general the Supreme, ix. 327; xii. 123), and after the general authorization of the work (ii. 7), which says that all laws proclaimed by Manu are directed in the Veda, we find twenty-two quotations referred emphatically to Manu. Of these, nine are in the portions of the work devoted to domestic and ceremonial rules and general laws of conduct, which we can call in general the part most nearly corresponding to the original form (Lectures iii.-vi., x., last part; none in ii., vii., xi.); while thirteen are in the portion devoted to civil and criminal law, a part that in the Sūtra literature holds a subordinate position, but keeps ever expanding (Lectures viii., ix.). It is in the latter portion that we should expect to find doubtful quotations.

In detail they are as follows.

A. FIRST GROUP:

1. iii. 36. Certain qualities have been declared by Manu for each marriage. The matter is old. The corresponding verses in *Mahābhārata*, while differing in detail, show that its authority as a *Manu-verse* was general, although the epic quotation is incorrect.
2. iii. 150. Manu declared a Brahmanic thief, eunuch, or infidel as unworthy of *havya* and *kavya*.
3. iii. 222. Manu declared that a son or grandson might partake of the *Crāddha*, when the father was dead.
4. iv. 103. Manu declared a suspension of study on certain occasions. *Medhatithi* says this is an "old verse," and by some regarded as opposed to verse 102, but it is supported by the *Sūtras*.
5. v. 41. Manu said cattle should be slain at sacrifice only. This is contained in *Vasistha*, and was probably in the *Mānava-Sūtra*.
6. v. 131. Manu said that beasts killed by dogs, *Cāṇḍālas*, and (other) *Dasyus* were pure.
7. vi. 54. Manu *Svāyambhuva* said that the vessels fit for ascetics were gourd, bowl, pot, rattan. Doubtful; not in *Medhatithi*'s commentary; *alābu* (gourd) occurs nowhere else; subject a disputed one.
8. x. 63. Manu declared a condensed rule of duty for the four castes.
9. x. 77, 78. Manu *Prajāpati* said that some of the duties of the Brahman cease with the *Kṣatriya* and *Vaiṣya*.

There is no reason for questioning the antiquity of any of these verses excepting the seventh, which is doubtful.

B. SECOND GROUP.

1. viii. 124. Manu *Svāyambhuva* declared ten places where punishment may be administered.
2. viii. 139. Ordinance of Manu regarding fine for debtor. This contradicts verse 59, and, according to *Nārāyaṇa*, is wanting in some MSS. (cf. verse 51).
3. viii. 168. Manu said that what was written by force was illegal. *Jolly* says this is stolen from *Nārada* iv. 55; it is the only distinct recognition of writing in the work, and is clearly interpolated.
4. viii. 204. Manu said that a suitor on a certain occasion might take two girls "at the same price." This contradicts the older law, where sale was not allowed, and contradicts the older sentiment of the treatise itself (iii. 51-54; ix. 98), where this implied purchase of wives is denounced.
5. viii. 242. Manu said that a cow with calf, bulls, cattle of gods, with or without keeper, should not be fined for injury. *Vas.*, *Baudh.*, *Āp.*, *Gaut.*, have nothing like this. *Yāj.* (ii. 163) omits the cattle of gods in a like list, and says the law holds only when there is no keeper. *Gaut.* in general says a cow is to be

fined (xii. 22). Visnu gives the rule only for bulls and cows with young (v. 150); if this refers to the sacred bulls of the gods (as in Viṣṇu lxxxvi.), it is quite late (cf. Jolly to Viṣṇu).

6. viii. 279. Ordinance of Manu: the limb of a low-caste man is to be cut off, if he injure a high-caste man therewith.

7. viii. 292. Manu says there is no penalty for a driver when straps, girth, etc. break. In verse 290 we have a general *āhuh* ('they say'); the first part is not in Medhātithi's gloss; the matter is late.

8. viii. 339. Manu said it was no theft to steal fruits and roots of large trees, fire-wood, or grass to feed cows with. This rule is ascribed by Āp. (1. 28. 2 ff.) to Vārsāyāṇi, though here to Manu; it appears to be a late restriction on verse 331.

9. ix. 17. Manu ordained certain traits for women (probably Prajāpati, the creator, is meant).

10. ix. 158. Manu Svāyambhuva declared that six were sons and heirs; six, sons and not heirs. Only the later law knows the twelve kinds of sons. The parallel verses in the Mahābhārata contradict the arrangements of the sons. The fact of its reference to Manu is nullified by the lateness of the matter.

11. 12. ix. 182, 183. Manu said that all brothers became fathers by one son; and that all wives became mothers by one son. These are not in the oldest commentator (Medh.); their matter and juxtaposition alone make them suspicious; verse 182 first crops out in the Mitāksarā.

13. ix. 239. A curse on sinners as "ordinance of Manu;" very late in matter and suspicious in form; unexampled in early literature.

In this group, only 1, 6, and 9 are of an antiquity not open to reasonable question; 5, 7, 8, 10, and 13 are of doubtful antiquity; and of the remainder, or 2, 3, 4, 11, and 12, there is every reason for suspecting the character.

To sum up: there is then in most of the nine cases in group A. (so far as the text-criticism goes) no reason to doubt the ancient character of the verses.

There is in group B. no reason for doubt on this point in three of the thirteen quotations, but some reason in five of them; while in the remaining five there is every reason to suspect their antiquity, and consequently to regard them as forgeries. The proportion is again significant. Even in the "treatise of Manu" itself we find the tendency to interpolation increasing in the later portions, and the "Manu" verses most frequent and most suspicious are in the most modern chapters. We have learned that the "treatise of the Mānavas" did not, as the Hindus think, come from Manu. It seems probable also that the "verses of Manu" do not, as European scholars assume, necessarily come from the Mānava-treatise.

NOTE: To the matter of the introductory remarks add *Manu=mantra* in xiii. 7. 18. The fulness of quotations in book xiii. contrasts with the lack of any in books xiv.-xviii., which in form are earlier. Even the Rig-Veda foreshadows the above process: x. 53 has five original and six added verses (Grassmann); in one of the latter we find Manu spoken of for the first time in the hymn (6. *Manur bhava*), unless the word be here better taken as an adjective.